

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are pending in this application, of which claim 1 has been amended.

Claim 3 has been canceled. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner has maintained from the previous Office Action the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 1-4 as anticipated by Shimazaki and the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 5 as unpatentable over Shimazaki in view of Morgan et al.

In Applicant's response of December 30, 2003, Applicant argued the following:

In Shimazaki, the Examiner has compared the 120 Volts AC external power source to the 3.7 Volts DC internal power source. This is in contrast to the present invention in which the external power source voltage  $V_{DD}$  of 5 Volts D.C. (regulated to 3.3 volts D.C.) is compared to the 2.8 Volts D.C. internal power source voltage powered by a battery.

Accordingly, in that response claim 1 was amended to recite that the internal power source has a D.C. voltage less than the D.C. voltage provided by the external source.

In response to this argument, the Examiner now argues:

Shimazaki does implicitly disclose the internal power source being lower in voltage than the external power source. Shimazaki discloses the internal power source being a battery (col. 4, lines 45-50) and the external power source being an electrical outlet (col. 3, lines 16-18). Inherently it is known the external power source is 120 Volts AC, and the internal power source is much lower than that (usually around 3.7 Volts). It is commonly known that the power supply of laptop converts the 120 Volts AC to a DC voltage usually around 20.5 Volts DC (see Potega U.S. Patent 6,459,175, col. 13, lines 10-18). Therefore, Shimazaki implicitly discloses the internal power source being lower in voltage than the external power source.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Despite the Examiner's assertions, **Shimazaki** does not disclose any internal battery voltage level, although it is well known that it is less than 120 Volts. However, the 120 Volts of the external source is AC and must be converted to a lower D.C. voltage level before reaching the circuitry of the laptop. U.S. Patent 6,459,175 to **Potega** suggests that this lower D.C. voltage may be 20.5 Volts D.C. However, neither reference discloses the relationship of the level of the AC-to-DC converted voltage to the internal battery voltage. Thus, **Shimazaki** does not disclose an internal power source which has a D.C. voltage less than a D.C. voltage provided by the external power source, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Furthermore, referring to claim 3, the Examiner argues, "Shimazaki discloses ... the portable electronic device having a USB connector conforming to the Universal Serial Bus standard, and one terminal of the USB connector provides the power source terminal (col. 3, lines 19-22)". However, col. 3, lines 19-22 of **Shimazaki** states only, "The USB port 112 is a port which conforms to the USB standards. A USB cable 117 is connected to the USB port 112, so that a peripheral device can be connected". The device is not so constructed that the external power source supplies power through the USB port 112. In **Shimazaki**, as shown in Fig. 3, power is supplied by either a battery pack 133 as an internal power source or an AC-DC adapter 116 as an external power source. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to recite that, "the external power source connected to a USB connector supplies power to the device through a

power source terminal of the USB connector when the first circuit means is in an active mode”,  
which is not disclosed in Shimazaki.

Thus, claim 3 has been canceled and its limitations added to claim 1, and the §102(e) and  
§103(a) rejections should be withdrawn.


In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-2 and 4-  
5, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the  
Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number  
indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an  
appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other  
fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

  
William L. Brooks  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla  
Atty. Docket No. 001716  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE